

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/624,017	07/21/2003	Gary Mitchell Davenport	IAM 0574 PA	5722	
27752	27752 7590 08/18/2005			EXAMINER	
	CTER & GAMBLE CO	FORD, ALLISON M			
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION WINTON HILL TECHNICAL CENTER - BOX 161			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE			1651		
CINCINNATI, OH 45224			DATE MAILED: 08/18/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/624,017	DAVENPORT ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Allison M. Ford	1651	

Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --THE REPLY FILED 29 July 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____ . A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below): (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below): (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 7. Tor purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: None. Claim(s) objected to: 27,28 and 34. Claim(s) rejected: 23-26,29-33,35 and 36. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11.

The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 13. Other: ___

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendment to claim 23 introduces new limitations not previously considered. Such new limitations would require an additional search for considerations of anticipation and obviousness.

Continuation of 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered, but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because the arguments regarding the failure of the references to anticipate the method of administering the composition to cats and rabbits are directed to limitations not in the presently examined claims. Furthermore, the arguments regarding the non-inherency of the method remain unpersuasive for the reasons of record. Applicant continues to argue that the Examiner has failed to establish inherency because one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have failed to recognize that the certain compositions disclosed by Reinhart et all or Sunvold et all could be successfully utilized to effectively control fecal hair excretion and trichobezoar formation. It is reiterated that the discovery of a new use for an old composition, based on unknown properties of the old composition, might be patentable to the discoverer as a process of using; however, when the claim recites using an old composition and the method, or "use," is directed to a result or property (as in ability to control fecal hair excretion and trichobezoar formation) of that composition, then the claim is anticipated. See In re May, 754 F.2d 1082, 1090, 197 USPQ 601 (CCPA 1978).

LEON B. LANKFORD, JR.
PRIMARY EXAMINEP